

### **REMARKS**

Applicant has reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on October 26, 2005, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 15, 17, 23, 24, 27, and 28 are amended, claim 2 is canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1 and 3-29 are now pending in this application.

#### **§102 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsai (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0229139) or Honary (U.S. Publication No 2005/0193357). Independent claims 1, 17, 23, and 27 have been amended to add additional limitations, and applicants respectfully believe that this rejection has been overcome as a result. For example, applicants respectfully submit that neither cited US Publication discloses “estimating power consumption of the groups using a pre-determined database that estimates the power for each instruction or configuration, depending on the underlying architecture of a target programmable element type for each group” as claimed independent claims 1, 17, 23, and 27. Support for the above-quoted amendment can be found in the specification as originally filed at page 8, lines 2-5.

Claims 1, 3-21 and 23-29 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Leaver (U.S. Patent No. 6,195,788). Independent claims 1, 17, 23, and 27 have been amended to add additional limitations, and applicants respectfully believe that this rejection has been overcome as a result. For example, applicants respectfully submit that Leaver does not disclose, teach, or suggest “estimating power consumption of the groups using a pre-determined database that estimates the power for each instruction or configuration, depending on the underlying architecture of a target programmable element type for each group” as claimed independent claims 1, 17, 23, and 27.

#### **§103 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 2 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leaver (U.S. Patent No. 6,195,788) in view of Jain (U.S. Patent No. 6,038,386). This rejection relies on

the rejection of claim 1 and 17 as being anticipated by Leaver. As discussed above, applicants respectfully believe that the independent claims now define over Leaver. Accordingly, applicants respectfully believe that the rejection of claims 2 and 22 under 35 USC § 103(a) has been overcome.

In addition to the claim amendments discussed above, claims 3, 4, 9, 15, 24, and 28 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (952-473-8800) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

VICKI W. TSAI ET AL.

By their Representatives,

Customer Number 45445

Telephone Number 952-473-8800

Date 1-9-06

By Dana B LeMoine

Dana B. LeMoine

Reg. No. 40,062

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O.Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 9 day of January, 2006.

Jane E. Sagers

Name

Jane E Sagers

Signature

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

Four sheets of formalized drawings are supplied herewith.